

P.GISS. I 106 REVISITED

P.Giss. I 106 (inv. 118; dated by the editor 'VI^P') contains a receipt for payment of rent issued by the heirs of a woman named Secundilla living in Hermopolis to the heirs of another person (cf. ll. 1-2) living in the same city. The rent is stated to be 1 sol., 12 keratia (= 1.5 solidus), paid from the crops of the 15th indiction (cf. ll. 3-5). Incorporating some corrected readings in ll. 3, 4 and 5 recently proposed by N. Gonis in ZPE 143 (2003) 158-159 the Greek text now reads:

- 1 † π(αρά) τῶν κλ(ηρονόμων) Σεκουντίλλας ἀπὸ Ἑρμο(υπό)λεως τοῖς κληρονόμοις)
- 2 [] ρα[] μιωκας ἀπὸ τῆς α(ὐτῆς) μη(τροπό)λεως). δεδώκατε καὶ ἐπλη[ρώ(σα)τε]
- 3 τὸ πάκτον τοῦ ἐμφυτεύμ(ατος) καρπῶν [π]εντεκαίδεκάτῃ[ς]
- 4 ἰνδ(ικτι)ό(νος) χρυσοῦ νόμισμα ἐν εὖστ(α)θ(μον) καὶ κεράτια δώδεκα [π]λ[ή(ρης),]
- 5 γί(ν.) χρ(υσοῦ) νό(μισμα) α κ(εράτια) ιβ πλ(ήρης) τὰ καὶ λο[γ]ι[σ]θ(έντα) ἡμῖν ἀπὸ
ἐμβολῆς
- 6 πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ[ς] ἰνδ(ικτι)ό(νος) ἐν τῇ τῆς λαμπρ(οτάτης) [Ἀν]τι[ν]όου (πό)λεως)]
κοιν[ῇ]
- 7 λογιστηρ(ίφ). καὶ πρὸς ὑμῶν ἀσφάλ(ειαν) π(ε)ποιήμεθα ὑμῖ[ν]
- 8 τὴν παρούσαν πληρωτικὴν ἀπόδειξιν ὡς πρόκι(ται).

The body of the receipt is followed by two lines containing a subscription in Coptic

- 9 (m. 2) ΔΝΟΚ (m. 3) ΓΔΒΡΙΗΛΙΑ ΤΙC-
- 10 ΤΟΙΧΕΙ †

Dr. Gonis rightly remarks that the curious sequence in ll. 6-7 cannot be upheld. To his doubts may be added that l. 2, too, contains some unlikely elements: one would not expect a phrasing ἀπὸ τῆς α(ὐτῆς) μη(τροπό)λεως), where normally a simple ἀπὸ τῆς α(ὐτῆς) πόλεως is found. As regards the reading of ll. 6-7, it is indeed unclear why according to l. 6 (mostly restored!) the rent would have been paid "in the κοινόν ('joint/common') λογιστήριον (= accounting office) of Antinoopolis".

A check of the photo of the papyrus available on the internet¹ allows us to propose the following corrected readings:

- 2 [] ρα[] μιωκας ἀπὸ τῆς α(ὐτῆς) μη(τροπό)λεως)
- Ἀβρα[α]μίου κασ() ἀπὸ Ταναμήν.

One could take the abbreviation κασ() as part of a noun indicating a profession like κασσιτεράς, κασσιτεροποιός, κασσιτερουργός, but an abbreviated father's name in Κασ- is not to be excluded. In favor of the latter solution it may be adduced that above the village name Ταναμήν there is also a marking stroke; for this village, see M. Drew-Bear, *Le Nome Hermopolite*, 264 (it is attested in the 7th and 8th cent.).

- 6-7 ἐν τῇ τῆς λαμπρ(οτάτης) [Ἀν]τι[ν]όου (πό)λεως)] κοιν[ῇ] | ⁽⁷⁾ λογιστηρ(ίφ)
- δ(ιὰ) [τοῦ] λαμπρ(οτάτου) [] [] β[ο]η[θ]οῦ | ⁽⁷⁾ λογιστηρ(ίου).

The lacuna before λαμπρ() offers space for only 3 rather than 5 letters, and the letters preceding the lacuna at the end of the line read much more easily as β[ο]η[θ] than as κοιν[ῇ], because the kappa elsewhere in this hand looks different from the kappa supposedly written here; for 'our' beta one may compare the beta in Ἀβρα[α]μίου (cf. above ad line 2). In between the words λαμπρ(οτάτου) and β[ο]η[θ]οῦ we expect a personal name occupying the place for [] [] [], but we cannot decipher it with certainty. The second preserved letter features only a vertical hasta, into which comes a tiny trace of the preceding

¹) Via the address <<http://bibd.uni-giessen.de/papyri/images/pgiss-inv.118recto.jpg>>.

(first) letter, rising slightly above line level; the third letter could be taken as a iota; one might even argue that coming after the curved lower part of the iota there is an exiguous trace of yet another (4th) letter.

Before proceeding we observe that one finds a similar combination of the epithet λαμπρότατος with a βοηθός in P.Oxy. I 125.7 (560^p); even more illustrative is another papyrus from Hermopolis, P. Würzb. 19.3 (622^p, cf. BL 8.513) mentioning a certain Fl. Magistor as λαμπρότατος βοηθός λογιστηρίου.²

The question, why in general a *boethos logisteriou* would appear as a third party in such a receipt (after all, the transaction is between a lessor and a lessee), can be answered simply by restoring δ[(ιὰ) τοῦ] in the lacuna before λαμπρ(). The lessor acknowledges to the lessee the full payment of an amount of rent (1 sol., 12 ker.) which earlier on had been set to their account (= λο[γ]ι[σ]θ[έν]τα) by an assistant of the public accounting office. For the background of the procedure concerning the collection of rent/tax, see J. Gascou, *Les grands domaines, la cité et l'état en Égypte byzantine*, T&M 9 (1985) 18ff. Finally, we observe (see our correction of ll. 6-7 above) that the papyrus should no longer be connected with Antinoopolis; the text comes from Hermopolis.

Leiden/Amsterdam

Nico Kruit
Klaas A. Worp

² For him see in particular P.J. Sijpesteijn in his first editions of SB XVI 12264 [628^p] and 12999 [626^p]. In our view there is not sufficient justification for reading in the Giessen papyrus the name as M]αγ[ι]σ[τ]αρος in its full form, as the lacuna before the letters βοη may contain probably only 2 letters, hence one would have to accept an abbreviation M]αγ[ι]σ[τ]α(ρος), or reckon with an undeclined form of the name. Such an approach, however, does not seem very comfortable and for that reason we would refrain from putting this name into the text of P.Giss. 106.6.